

**IN THE UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT  
FOR THE NORTHERN DISTRICT OF TEXAS  
DALLAS DIVISION**

<b>RANDY HIETMAN,</b>	)	
<b>ID # 27948-077,</b>	)	
<b>Movant,</b>	)	<b>No. 3:17-CV-1962-G (BH)</b>
<b>vs.</b>	)	<b>No. 3:95-CR-0160-G (04)</b>
	)	
<b>UNITED STATES OF AMERICA,</b>	)	
<b>Respondent.</b>	)	<b>Referred to U.S. Magistrate Judge</b>

**RECOMMENDATION REGARDING REQUEST TO PROCEED  
IN FORMA PAUPERIS ON APPEAL**

Under 28 U.S.C. § 636(b) and *Amended Miscellaneous Order No. 6* (adopted by *Special Order No. 2-59* on May 5, 2005), requests to proceed *in forma pauperis* are automatically referred.

Before the Court are the movant's request to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal, received on September 11, 2017 (doc. 7), and a copy of his inmate statement, received on December 8, 2017 (doc. 10).<sup>1</sup>

The movant did not file a signed certificate of his inmate trust account as required. Additionally, his inmate statement reflects that he had \$ 13,908.45 in his inmate trust account as of December 4, 2017. The movant has not shown that he is a pauper, and his motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* should be denied.

**SO RECOMMENDED this 13th day of December, 2017.**

  
IRMA CARRILLO RAMIREZ  
UNITED STATES MAGISTRATE JUDGE

---

<sup>1</sup>The motion to proceed *in forma pauperis* on appeal did not include a certificate of inmate trust account for the sixth-month period preceding the filing of his notice of appeal, as required by 28 U.S.C. § 1915(a)(2). Accordingly, on November 6, 2017, he was ordered to file a properly signed certificate of inmate trust account. (*See* doc. 9.) He was warned that if he did not comply, denial of the motion would be recommended. (*See id.*)